

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 – 10 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 4, 6 and 8 – 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tantlinger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,386,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claim 2 was previously cancelled in the Office Action submitted January 20, 2004. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 is moot. Applicant further notes that claim 7 was not specifically rejected or even discussed in the present Office Action. However, Applicant will proceed to address claim 7 in view of Tantlinger et al.

Applicant respectfully notes that claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to include inserting the axle through a support hole formed in a wall of a mounting bracket. Tantlinger et al. fails to teach or suggest insertion of an axle through a support hole formed in a wall of a mounting bracket. More particularly, Tantlinger et al is limited to teaching an axle 23 to running transverse to apertures 27,29 of bracket flanges 17,19. Welds 35,37 secure tube side walls 31,33 to the bracket flanges 17,19 at the apertures 27,29. The bracket flanges 17,19 are U-shaped and the axle 23 runs parallel to the walls of the bracket flanges 17,19. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant notes that claims 3, 4, 6 and 8 – 10 directly depend on one of claims 1 and 7, which define over the prior art as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 6 and 8 – 10 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2004

By: 

Joseph M. Lafata
Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/RPM